



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME IV
NUMBER 5

MAY, 1896

WHOLE
NUMBER 35

MEETING OF THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, UNI- VERSITY OF CHICAGO, APRIL 3 AND 4, 1896.

THE Association met Friday afternoon, April 3, at half past two o'clock, with President Angell, of the University of Michigan, in the chair.

President Harper, of The University of Chicago, was introduced to the convention to offer the greeting of The University of Chicago. He spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME OF PRESIDENT HARPER.

I have no formal address of welcome to make, but I am sure that the welcome is none the less cordial. We are glad to have with us the representatives of the institutions in the great district represented by this association. We consider it a privilege and an honor to have you accept the invitation of the University to hold the meeting of the association this year at this place. I suppose that individuals in modern times in our collegiate work as well as in secondary school work receive attention which they did not receive in the old days of education. In other words, individualism plays a more prominent part today in education than in the past. This same individualism is something which appears in our institutions as well as in our methods of instruction. Each institution is an individual. It takes many individuals to make

the whole, of which each forms a part. We are individuals as institutions in the matter of our environment, for no matter how closely we may be located to each other, each has its own constituency, each has its own environment. We are individuals as institutions in the sense that each represents something that is different from that which all the others represent. Individualism in institutions has grown in the last ten or fifteen or twenty years, but after all we have at heart the same work, we have in mind the same purpose, we are doing the same thing and we come together this afternoon to learn how to do this thing better. Perfection in method and work is far beyond us. We may never hope to reach it, but we must strive for it, and in that effort the experience of our brethren will count for more than all other things combined. We understand that this is the purpose of the association, and representing The University of Chicago I welcome you most heartily. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that one of the most essential features after all, as it seems to me, in an organization of this kind is the social side; the grasp of each other's hands, and the opportunity to look into each other's faces. Believing this to be true, the committee of arrangements has provided for opportunities of a social character. The University invites the members of the association to dine together in one of our buildings this afternoon at 6:30, and to take luncheon together tomorrow at 12:30. Perhaps these social meetings may help to accomplish the work for which the association was organized. Again, I say, we welcome you, and if there is anything that we can do while you are here to make your stay more profitable and pleasant you will be kind enough to command us.

Following the address of President Harper came the address of the President of the Association, President James B. Angell, of the University of Michigan, who spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ANGELL.

We have assembled here with the pleasantest memories of the organization of this association a year ago under the hospita-

ble roof of the Northwestern University. Now that we are gathered to begin the actual work of our society, we desire first of all to express our gratitude to you, Mr. President, and through you to the authorities of this institution, for the hearty welcome you have given us to the halls of this young but vigorous university. As we walk through her stately halls, which have risen almost as swiftly and as magically as the fair (but alas! now vanished) structures of the White City, and mingle with the great company of eminent scholars that she has drawn to her chairs of instruction, we need no special gifts of prophecy to foresee what a noble race of scholars she will send forth.

Felix prole virūm ;
Laeta deūm partu, centum complexa nepotes,
Omnes cœlicolas, omnes supra alta tenentes.

An association like this must needs find a congenial atmosphere in Chicago. For of late years not only have the problems of secondary education received here earnest and thoughtful attention from some of the ablest educational leaders in the country, but here, too, the mutual relations of the secondary and the higher education have been carefully studied.

I hope it will never be forgotten in the history of this society, which I doubt not has a long and useful life before it, that it owes its existence to the suggestions and persuasions of some of the enterprising secondary teachers who, as members of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club, had for years been discussing such questions as we are to consider at this meeting. They had brought to those discussions an enthusiasm and earnestness which I have never seen surpassed in any educational association. They believed that all these states which are represented in this society should aim to reach a substantial agreement on the most important problems in secondary and higher education, or, if that were not possible, should see clearly the grounds on which different opinions can be defended. The life of this society was therefore rooted in a real experience. The prompt and hearty response which the suggestion of those Michigan schoolmasters met throughout these North Central states showed that the same need

of coöperation between college and school which they had felt was also felt throughout the whole West. The time was ripe for the undertaking. It is for us to prove ourselves worthy of the opportunity which has been furnished us.

Within my recollection a most auspicious change in the relations of colleges and secondary schools has taken place. In my boyhood there were in New England very few high schools which prepared boys for college. The relations between the colleges and the academies were far from intimate. While I was a student in three preparatory academies I saw only once a college professor in school, though one of the schools was in a building owned by a college adjacent to it. We boys in school and the public generally knew little of what the college was or what it really attempted to do. People for the most part thought of college professors as harmless persons living in monastic seclusion and disseminating useless knowledge to aristocratic and rather eccentric young men. The academy was better comprehended, and was deemed of more practical value than the college. But it pursued its way without much regard to the work or requirements of the college, since by far the larger part of the students did not go to college.

As the high schools afterwards supplanted many of the academies, they at first hardly had in mind at all the preparation of boys for college. Until a very recent time some of the principal college officers in New England have, very unwisely, as I think, discouraged the towns from establishing and supporting high schools. But finding at last that the high schools have "come to stay," these men are now cultivating friendly relations with them. A considerable proportion of the New England boys are now fitted for college in the high schools, and a large number of the old county academies are moribund or dead. All over New England the college teachers are now meeting with the teachers of the secondary schools, whether academies or high schools, to discuss subjects of common interest to all.

In this part of the country the situation has been somewhat different. The high schools were started so early that for sev-

eral years they have furnished a large part of the college students. It is an interesting fact that in Michigan the University really founded the schools which became the first high schools. It established them as branches of the University. After a few years it was determined that the funds of the University could not be rightly used for the support of the branches. The towns or districts then assumed the charges of maintaining the schools as union schools or high schools. But throughout Michigan and throughout the whole West the principal towns and cities in rapid succession established their high schools, and in many cases were lavish in their expenditures upon them. In almost any western city, the finest building is the high school. The main purpose of these schools is to give a somewhat generous education to such boys and girls as can attend them. But most of them do also prepare students for college. They bid fair to be the preparatory schools from which our colleges must draw the great majority of their students. There is room in the West for a limited number of private schools and academies which are to do preparatory work. The preparatory schools immediately connected with colleges are dropping off, one by one, and will, I think, entirely disappear before long. Apparently the most of the preparatory work will be done by the high schools. The principle upon which they are supported is sometimes challenged. But, if some care is used, as it ought to be, to guard against extravagance in the conduct of them, the people, whose children are trained in these schools to take responsible positions in life, are not likely to abandon them.

We who are in the colleges cannot be too deeply interested in them, or in too close relations with them. We must not ask of them more than they can do under the conditions of their life. In our desire to lift the grade of college work, we are in danger of leaving a gap between us and them. The high school teachers are as a rule sufficiently ambitious to carry their work up to a higher plane. We must help them so far as we can to make advances without forfeiting the support of the tax-payers. In the occasional reactions of public sentiment against the main-

tenance of high schools, which are necessarily more costly than the schools of lower grade, we must stand firmly by them. We should endeavor to impress school boards with our sense of the dignity which properly belongs to the high office of principal of an important high school. We should show them on all fitting occasions that no one should be called to that responsible office who is not a man of broad and comprehensive views of the function of the school, and who has not some decided power of impressing himself strongly on the minds and character of his pupils.

We must even look below the high schools, and keep ever in mind the essential unity of educational work. Under our forms of organization we have cut the process of education too much into disconnected sections, and placed high barriers of formal and formidable examinations between them. The pupil, instead of seeing an inviting path, clear and open before him, leading from the primary school to the university, has had his vision bounded by obstacles, towering higher and higher as he advanced. The most skillful primary teacher, at whose feet I for one often sit in humility and wonder, has not always been encouraged by teachers in the high school and college to feel that her pursuit and ours are one in kind and in dignity.

I cannot but hope that the conferences and discussions in which the representatives of collegiate and of secondary education in this association are to participate, are to bring us into most fruitful intimacy with each other, and to lead us to large and catholic views of education. Never before, I think, has the interest in education been so widespread and profound as it is now. Never before have so many of our earnest and gifted scholars been engaged in the careful study of educational problems. We therefore enter upon our work under the most auspicious circumstances. Fired with enthusiasm for our calling as teachers, let us, representatives of ten great states, do our utmost by the deliberations and discussions of this association, to make our secondary and higher education of the highest service to these commonwealths and to the whole nation.

The first event on the regular programme was a paper by President Charles Kendall Adams, of the University of Wisconsin, on the report of the New England Convention on College Entrance Requirements in History. President Angell announced that President Adams was seriously ill, and had been unable to complete the preparation of his paper. President Edward D. Eaton, who was to have opened the discussion of President Adams' paper, spoke instead on the general subject of the report.

PRESIDENT E. D. EATON, BELOIT COLLEGE.

In February of last year the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools appointed a committee of five to prepare a report on Requirements for College in History. The committee put forth their report in April. At the meeting of the Association at Providence in October their report, after thorough discussion, was adopted by a vote of thirty-five to seven, and recommended to the colleges for adoption.

There are three points which are worthy of special notice with regard to this report. The first is the emphasis laid upon the importance of giving prominence to history in secondary schools. In this I am sure we shall all agree with them, whether we regard some of their specific recommendations as practicable or not. The old notion according to which history was viewed as a matter of annals or dignified gossip has given place largely to a truer conception of it as one of the most important of the studies that can engage the minds of the young. History, according to Droysen's suggestive thought, is the "know thyself" of humanity. "Grappling with history is grappling with life." What is gained by travel, what is gained by coming in touch with eminent men, may be in a good degree attained by studying history. The horizon is broadened, the perspective changed, and life becomes not merely local, but national and international in its scope. As life always proceeds from life, so life that is to be generously developed must be kept in contact with generous life. It is the function of history to bring the student in touch with the world's great movements and great men, and to quicken and strengthen the moral faculties by observation of the outworking of moral issues in individual and national careers. It seems manifest, then, that this study should

have a large and increasingly larger place in the courses of our secondary schools.

In Germany, where so much attention has been given to the order and proportion of studies, ten years are given to history in the secondary schools, two periods per week for two years, and after that three periods per week for eight years. It is evident that this consecutive work at once lifts history from the position of a mere side study or cram study as a "poor relation of the classics," and enables it to become a progressive discipline and enrichment of the mind. In the same spirit the Conference on History, Civil Government, and Political Economy, which was appointed by the Committee of Ten of the National Educational Association, and met in Madison, Wis., in 1892, recommended that eight years of consecutive study be given to history in secondary schools, four of the years being below the high school. The New England report lays out a four years' course of historical study for high schools and academies, the first year being upon the history of Greece, the second upon that of Rome, the third upon either that of England, France or Germany, and the fourth year a more detailed study of some limited period, preferably of American or English history, excepting in the case of modern language courses, in which it is suggested that the fourth year be upon the history of France and Germany, because of the opportunity thus given for the use of those languages in this intensive work.

The second point to be noted in this report is its implying the necessity of a better grade of history teaching. The two things naturally go together. If history is of such importance in broadening the mental scope, in training the moral faculties, and in affording contact with the experience of the race, then we need in that as in other departments the best instruction possible. The old idea once prevalent that instruction in history could be given by anybody with a taste for reading has been discredited by the work of the carefully trained men and women who make this a scientific study, laying out laboratory and seminary work, giving the pupils an insight into the processes of investigation and requiring the exercise of independent thought in preparation.

The third point, the practical body of the report, concerns the relation of secondary schools to colleges as regards the requirements to be made by the colleges for admission. The report recommends seven topics in history, any two of which (excepting the seventh),

having each been the subject of a year's study, three periods per week, may be presented as meeting the college requirements. These are: first, Greece, with special reference to Greek life, literature, and art; second, Rome, including the Teutonic invasions, down to A.D. 800; third, Germany, and fourth, France, each in their relations to mediæval and modern Europe; fifth, England, especially in its social and political development; sixth, American history, including the elements of civil government; seventh, a year of intensive study on some limited field. It is specially recommended that, whichever two subjects be presented for admission, the others may be credited for advanced standing in college or university.

With regard to these recommendations, I believe that the history of the United States should always be required, for reasons hardly needing statement, and that of the other topics two should be required, with at least a strong preference for Greece or Rome, because of their fundamental relation to modern life and thought. They are not less important studies for those who do not have a college course in view. Not long ago I found in a Milwaukee high school a class in a modern language or science course reporting readings in the *Iliad*, which they were studying as literature in various translations. The teacher informed me that there was a noteworthy interest felt by the pupils in this study, and there can be no question of its value to them.

The matter of credits for advanced standing is a difficult one to discuss apart from the consideration of individual institutions. I doubt the practicability of such credits in history excepting in rare cases where the work may have been exceptionally thorough; even in such cases it would probably be better to allow the extra history work to be substituted for some other requirement for admission than to let it entitle the applicant to advanced standing.

The report further recommends that satisfactory evidence of written work done in the secondary school should have weight in determining the candidate's preparation for college; that such written work should include notes and digests of outside reading, written recitations upon special topics requiring the exercise of judgment, written parallels of periods and persons, brief investigations of local topics, and the preparation of historical maps. The final recommendation is that entrance examinations be so framed as to test the judgment as well as the memory of the student. I think these recommendations will commend themselves to secondary schools and colleges alike, as

putting a larger responsibility upon the teacher and encouraging a better quality of work in teacher and pupil, as giving due credit to the schools for good work done, and as enabling college examiners to estimate more justly the quality of the preparation of applicants for admission.

President Eaton was followed by Principal C. W. French, of the Hyde Park High School.

PRINCIPAL C. W. FRENCH, HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL.

It is somewhat embarrassing to stand before this audience and discuss a paper, which has not been read. Yet no one can doubt that President Adams would be in sympathy with any movement which tends to make the methods of history teaching more systematic and rational than they are at present, and it is not difficult to believe that he would indorse the general features of the report which is under consideration today.

We all welcome most heartily every effort which tends to raise the standard of the secondary schools and to bring them into closer connection with the colleges. And it is certain that the appointment of such committees as have recently considered the purposes and methods of work in the various departments of school life marks an epoch in educational history.

There are certainly strong reasons for the investigation of our present methods of teaching history, for it must be admitted that in the past the work of our high schools in this department has been comparatively barren of results. There are numerous reasons for such inefficiency, but they may be all grouped under three heads: (1) imperfect aims, (2) imperfect methods, (3) imperfect system.

The aim of history teaching is twofold: (1) to convey information, (2) to discipline the mind by cultivating the memory, imagination, judgment, the power of expression and the moral and emotional natures. Many teachers have failed to appreciate this twofold purpose and have taught history merely as an information subject, and even in this case it is surprising how large a fund of ignorance, a class can store up in one or two years' study. The more thoroughly we understand the true purpose of history teaching and the more fully we govern our teaching by it the more satisfactory will be our results.

The work of these various conferences, the investigations of indi-

vidual teachers, and the discussions that are being carried on in our educational meetings all tend to the better understanding of proper methods and the more general adoption of them.

But little progress has been made in removing the difficulty referred to in the third reason for the inefficiency of our history teaching. The system is still at fault, and it is to its rectification that the attention of educators is now generally directed. It is with this subject that the reports of the Madison conference and the New England committee were largely concerned. In the past the courses presented have been meager and their arrangement has been without system and wholly unscientific. While many claim that history is not and cannot be a science, all must admit that there is a science of investigation and presentation of historical materials and principles, which has been largely ignored in our school work.

This science demands that there be a logical development of the subject through successive years by proper sequences and expansions, and that a practical uniformity of system be generally adopted. This work has been done in connection with the study of languages, ancient and modern, in mathematics, the natural sciences and to a considerable extent in literature, but the necessity for it in history has hardly been recognized until recently.

If the recommendations of the Madison conference could be generally adopted, the difficulties would largely cease to exist. This report, with that of the New England committee, marks the greatest advance that has ever been made in the discussion of history teaching. Yet, while I am heartily in accord with the most of the recommendations of the latter committee, there are some points in which I must differ.

I believe it is generally admitted that the regular high school course and the college preparatory course ought not to differ materially; that the same course which lays the best foundation for future study ought also to lay the best foundation for future life; that no more broad and exhaustive work is needed in the one than in the other, and that the real aim of each is towards the acquisition of power rather than of knowledge solely.

If it is granted that there is to be but one course for both classes of students, I would like to see the colleges require an equivalent of three years' work in history on the basis of three recitations a week. And I would further urge that this work should practically cover the

important features of the world's history and not of two or three countries alone, as at present contemplated.

The amount of work which a pupil must do in the first year of the high school absolutely forbids the addition of another subject. But it is possible to introduce a properly graded series of history courses at the beginning of the second year, which shall continue through the remaining three years.

If we reduce the four years to three, it would seem to necessitate a rearrangement of the subjects as they appear in this report. If we are going to send our pupils out into the world with a knowledge of only two or three countries, they will be insufficiently equipped, and without the broad grasp of the subject which will fit them to enter the university or to go out into the world. I cannot agree with these gentlemen that general history ought to be eliminated from the high school courses. It seems to me that it ought to remain (1), because it gives a broad and comprehensive view of the development of human life and society; (2) because it enables the pupil to compare and correlate contemporaneous persons and events properly; (3) because it forms a broad basis for later and more specific study.

President Adams, some years ago, wrote as follows upon the subject:

"The beginning of all organized knowledge is the acquisition of a certain number of facts and truths. These facts, moreover, must not be limited in range to a single portion of the subject we are to study. They must be comprehensive in their scope. . . . We must know something of the heavens as a whole before we can well understand the double stars or even the moon. We shall be unable to explain the jubilant prosperity of a great and growing city unless we have acquired a considerable knowledge of the region of which that city is the political and commercial center. Thus we see that there is a certain necessary order of succession, an order which seems to be founded in the law so well formulated by Herbert Spencer, 'There can be no correct idea of a part without a correct idea of the correlative whole.'"

If general history takes up the second year, Greek and Roman history may be introduced into the third year, and the fourth year may be devoted to special topics and to intensive study. If general history must be omitted, there should be such an arrangement of courses and subjects that the proper sequences could be preserved.

It is doubtful if intensive study can be taken up with profit in secondary schools. Original work consists of three elements: discovery, criticism and interpretation. Discovery is of course out of the question, but it is possible that some students may work with credit along the lines of criticism and interpretation. For example, historic material might be studied in reference to the writer, his means of information, his character for sagacity and discernment, and his interests, associations and affections, and upon the result of such investigations a judgment might be formed in regard to the reliability of the author's statements. Then possibly some features of the actual life of the times might be recreated by inference and logical deduction.

If this work is done at all, it should be done largely in connection with American history, because original documents are easily procured in this department and because our schools, as a rule, do not adequately teach the history of our own country. I believe that the study of American history ought to be encouraged in all grades from the grammar, through the high school and the college. Any effort that is made in this direction will tend to raise the standard of scholarship as well as that of citizenship.

While all must admit that it is desirable to lengthen and enrich our history courses, many will question its practicability. And the subject of ways and means is certainly a serious one. Time will not permit me to do more than to give a single suggestion. Colleges require for admission from four to eight years of foreign language work, from two to three years of mathematics, one year of English literature, and from six months to one year of history work. I know of students who have passed their examinations in history after three months' work in class. It seems to me that such a system of requirements is not properly correlated. Is there any reason why foreign languages should occupy from one-fourth to one-half of all the time given to preparation? Is it not a survival from an inferior civilization? Ought we not to have advanced farther beyond the standard of 1643, when Harvard College prescribed her admission requirements as follows:

"When any scholar is able to understand Tully or such like classical author extempore, and to make and speak true Latin in verse and prose, and to decline perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbs in the Greek tongue, let him then and not before, be capable of admission to college."

Why not admit a student to college with preparation in only one foreign language and make it possible, thereby, to put the study of history upon a scientific basis in the secondary schools? I believe our pupils would then go into the college and into the world with broader sympathies and greater power to cope with the great problems with which civilization and culture are sure to confront them.

The question was then thrown open for general discussion.

PRINCIPAL E. W. COY, HUGHES HIGH SCHOOL, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The last point that was made was one that I had in mind from the outset of this discussion. It is easy to say on occasions like this that the schools ought to give more time to this or to that subject, and I was wondering all the way along how it was to be done. I will say from my own observation that the teaching of history in the high schools has been as unsatisfactory as any subject we have to deal with. We have not time enough for it. I wish those who would give three or four years to history in the courses for the high school would sit down and make out a course of study and put it in. The Committee of Ten tried that experiment and the result was that when they came to make out a programme on the basis of these recommendations they had more hours work than there were hours in the week. At the same time, I will acknowledge that we ought to have more time for history. How are we going to get it? I think there is no way of getting it except by prolonging the course of the high school. I am in favor of prolonging it downward.

PRINCIPAL JNO. T. BUCHANAN, HIGH SCHOOL, Kansas City, Mo.

The arguments made have been largely in support of the opinion that history ought to take a place in the daily curriculum as a subject for four years. Now, if these arguments are to have any weight, what is their potency if, instead of history, science, language, literature, or something else is to be substituted? Why in one breath should gentlemen say that history ought to be in the daily programme, and in the next say that something else might take its place? I am in favor of alternatives, but not on the ground that history ought to be in the course for four years, and at the same time not be in. If history is of the importance that gentlemen on this floor would have us believe it is, then its place should not be supplanted by other subjects.

But, Mr. President and gentlemen, is history of such preëminent importance that it should take one-fourth of all a student's time during his career in high school? Our Latin friends claim a fourth for Latin; our science friends, a fourth for science; our modern language friends, a fourth for French, and another fourth for German; our Greek friends want Greek to appear in the curriculum; English should have a place; mathematics a place. Now, if history be given the time that gentlemen appear to demand for it, some other

subject whose admirers deem equally as important as history, must be left out of the curriculum. I am of the opinion that four years cannot be given to the study of history in the high school, and the integrity of the curriculum at the same time be maintained.

My efforts in making out courses of study ought to give me some advantage as an expert; and my opinion is, that a course containing history for four years will do violence to some study equally as valuable. But, gentlemen, if you do not concur in this opinion, do as suggested by the speaker who has just preceded me (Mr. E. W. Coy), sit down, make out a satisfactory course of study which includes history for four years, and let us see it.

PRINCIPAL H. L. BOLTWOOD, EVANSTON (ILL.) HIGH SCHOOL.

I think that the teachers in secondary schools are pretty unanimous in saying that the requirements for college are exceeding the hours at our disposal. The requirements already compel twenty recitations a week. We have been held pretty closely to the idea that we are not intensifying enough; that we ought to concentrate on certain studies. Are two recitation periods a week enough to keep a subject well in mind? Is it better to recite twice a week or to recite five times a week with a corresponding reduction in time?

Going back to this question of extending the college course, thus involving a prolonging of the secondary school course, and prolonging the grammar school course, is it not a fact that somewhere we are making the mistake of getting more information and less mental development? Did not the colleges of sixty years ago, with their narrow courses, produce a better average quality of men? I think that the colleges must accept from the schools thorough work in what is required and not multiply the requirements any further. I believe that history is a desirable thing to be had; but the point has been well taken that in the public high schools we must provide for the great number of pupils who never will go to college. In any school there is a certain percentage of pupils whom it is a pleasure to teach. They like to learn. The colleges want that kind; but they are not going to get them as a whole. They are going to get the average boy and girl who need to be driven and need to be led in various ways; and they must not give us too much to do, or we shall send them with a little of everything and not well trained in anything. The colleges are anxious for higher work, but they must remember that some of these things must be postponed. Professors like mature pupils, of course; but there is wisdom in what the small boy said, "There's one thing God can't do; he can't make a two-year-old colt in a minute."

PRINCIPAL J. O. LESLIE, HIGH SCHOOL, Ottawa, Ill.

A few weeks ago the board of education together with the teachers of our high school met together, and we discussed the difficulties of the situation. I set before the board of education the requirements of the colleges and asked

them what they would do about it. They are plain, practical men. They said we had too much to do. We require work that takes a great deal of time. Latin, physics and laboratory work cannot be done so as to get satisfactory results without taking a good deal of time. Neither can the student do good work in history without more time than the ordinary pupil has. We can give four year's work in Latin, and three in Greek, French or German, together with the work in mathematics, science, literature and history usually required; but this amount cannot be materially increased without causing us serious difficulty. What bothers us is to meet the requirements of all the colleges. There is no difficulty in meeting the requirements of the University of this state (Illinois), neither have we had any trouble in meeting the requirements of the University of Michigan. But when it comes to meeting *all* the requirements of *all* the colleges, then we are in difficulty; and the colleges controlled by women cause us more trouble than all the others. If the colleges of the Northwest would make one uniform set of requirements, I believe they could be made reasonable enough so that we could meet them satisfactorily.

PROFESSOR JOHN DEWEY, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

There is one suggestion to be emphasized. That is that the course might be extended downwards. If there is to be any solution of the congestion in the secondary schools it must be in breaking down the rigid barrier between the so-called higher education and primary education. There are primary schools in existence that have eight years of historical work — schools which begin history in the first grade and keep it up. This introduction of history into the primary grades has come almost entirely without help or pressure from the higher grades. It has come because the teachers in those grades felt the need of getting something more adjusted to the needs of the pupils, something more vital than the usual formal three Rs. I think it will be found that the interests of the high school and college would be furthered by devoting a part of their energies to seeing what can be done towards introducing history as a part of the regular work of the lower grades and in improving the methods of teaching history in the lower grades. We can't pile everything into the secondary school; we must find relief farther back.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS.

It was moved by Dean C. H. Thurber, of Morgan Park Academy, that a committee be appointed to consider the study of History and of College Entrance Requirements in History to report tomorrow.

President W. S. Chaplin, of Washington University, moved to amend by substituting for the word "tomorrow" the words,

"at the next regular meeting of the Association." The amendment was accepted by Mr. Thurber, and the amended motion was adopted.

At the suggestion of President Angell the motion was adopted that committees be appointed on nomination, and on time and place of meeting.

The following were appointed as Committee on Nominations: President Henry Wade Rogers, Northwestern University; President Joseph Swain, Indiana State University; Professor John Dewey, University of Chicago; Principal W. A. Greeson, Grand Rapids High School, and President George S. Albee, Oshkosh Normal School.

The following were appointed as Committee on Time and Place of Meeting: President Andrew S. Draper, of the University of Illinois; President Joseph Swain, of Indiana State University, and Principal W. H. Butts, of Michigan Military Academy.

President Harper then, on behalf of The University, invited all present to dine at the Haskell Museum Building at half past six o'clock.

DINNER AT HASKELL MUSEUM.

Delegates and other guests, to the number of about one hundred, assembled for dinner in the Haskell Museum at half past six. An elaborate dinner was served, after which toasts were responded to by representatives of the various states included in the Association. The exercises were pleasantly varied by songs by the University Glee Club. Most of the evening was occupied by the dinner and toasts, and the proposed reception at President Harper's house was abandoned.

MORNING SESSION, APRIL 4, 1896.

The association met at 10 A.M. in the Chapel, President Angell in the chair. The topic for the morning was introduced by President Richard H. Jesse, of the University of Missouri, in the following paper: